



UNITÉ DE RECHERCHE  
INRIA-ROCQUENCOURT

Institut National  
de Recherche  
en Informatique  
et en Automatique

Domaine de Voluceau  
Rocquencourt  
B.P.105  
78153 Le Chesnay Cedex  
France  
Tél.: (1) 39 63 55 11

# Rapports de Recherche

N° 1392

## *Programme 6*

*Calcul scientifique, Modélisation et  
Logiciels numériques*

## COMPARISON OF SOME OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHMS FOR OPTIMUM SHAPE DESIGN IN AERODYNAMICS

Olivier PIRONNEAU  
Andreas VOSSINIS

Février 1991



★ R R - 1 3 9 2 ★

COMPARISON OF SOME OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHMS  
FOR OPTIMUM SHAPE DESIGN IN AERODYNAMICS

COMPARAISON DE QUELQUES ALGORITHMES POUR  
L' OPTIMISATION DE FORMES EN AERODYNAMIQUE

Olivier PIRONNEAU<sup>1</sup>  
Andreas VOSSINIS<sup>1,2</sup>

1 INRIA - Rocquencourt - B.P. 105 - 78153 Le Chesnay - FRANCE

2 National Technical University of Athens - 42, Patission Str.  
10682 Athens - GREECE

## **Abstract**

Optimum Shape Design Problems in Fluid Mechanics have important industrial applications. Evidently, it is desired that optimization methods are quick and with low memory requirement. The numerical methods used for the solution of optimization problems frequently need the computation of the gradient of the cost function and usually require a linear search method. These computations include the solution of a fluid mechanics problem several times, so they may be time consuming.

Optimization methods which don't need the gradient computation of the cost functional have been developed, but often they are not general. We compare in this work certain Optimization Methods which use the gradient computation and some others that don't need the gradient. We are interested in the behaviour of every method till its convergence and in its convergence speed.

**Keywords:** Optimization, Fluid Mechanics, Finite Element Method, Optimum Design.

## **Résumé**

Les problèmes d'Optimization de Forme en Mécanique de Fluides ont d'importantes applications industrielles. Evidemment, on veut que les méthodes d'optimisation soient rapides et peu encombrantes en mémoire. Les Méthodes Numériques utilisées pour la solution des problèmes d'optimization ont souvent besoin du calcul du gradient de la fonction-coût et d'habitude demandent une minimisation monodimensionnelle. Ces calculs comprennent la solution d'un problème de la mécanique de fluides de nombreuses fois, donc ils prennent beaucoup de temps.

Des Méthodes d'Optimization qui ne nécessitent pas le calcul du gradient de la fonction-coût ont été développées, mais elles ne sont pas toujours générales.

On compare dans ce travail certaines méthodes d'optimization qui utilisent le calcul du gradient et quelques méthodes qui ne le nécessitent pas. On s'intéresse au comportement de chaque méthode jusqu'à la convergence et à sa vitesse de convergence.

**Mots-clefs:** Optimization, Mécanique de Fluides, Méthode des Eléments Finis, Design Optimum.

# CONTENTS

## **0. Introduction**

## **I. An Optimization Problem**

### **I.1 Description of the Problem**

### **I.2 The State Equation**

### **I.3 The Optimization Problem**

### **I.4 Variational Formulation and Discretization**

### **I.5 The Discrete Formulation of the Problem and its Constraints**

## **II. Solution of the Problem**

### **II.1 Construction of the mesh**

### **II.2 Gradient Methods**

#### **II.2.1 Computation of the Discrete Gradient of $E_h$**

#### **II.2.2 Steepest Descent Method**

#### **II.2.3 Generalized Minimal Residual Algorithm (GMRES)**

### **II.3 Methods with no Gradient Computation**

#### **II.3.1 GMRES as a Minimization Tool**

#### **II.3.2 Powell's Method**

#### **II.3.3 Least Squares Method**

## **III. Numerical Experiments**

### **III.1 Problems Treated**

### **III.2 Results**

### **III.3 Comments and Conclusion**

## **IV. Application in the optimization of lifting bodies**

### **IV.1 Description of the Problem and of the State Equation**

### **IV.2 Variational Formulation and Discretization**

### **IV.3 Solution of the Optimization Problem**

### **IV.4 Airfoil Optimization with Pressure Recovery Criterion**

### **IV.5 Numerical Experiments**

#### **IV.5.1 Tests for the Velocity Recovery Criterion**

#### **IV.5.2 Tests for the Pressure Recovery Criterion**

### **IV.6 Comments and Conclusion**

## **APPENDIX A**

### **Bibliography**

## 0. INTRODUCTION

Optimum shape design problems in fluid mechanics require the solution of the state equations many times and this is expensive.

Several methods have been developed and have been found to be efficient. Some of them use the gradient of the cost functional in order to find the direction on which optimization must be done. In this case attention is needed when computing the gradient, because this is usually costly.

We use in this work gradient methods and methods which don't need the gradient computation in order to solve a model problem, namely to find the nozzle which has a certain velocity distribution on its walls under the assumption of a two dimensional, irrotational and incompressible flow and with a given flux. The functional to minimize is a velocity difference norm integral on the unknown boundary. We use the finite element method in order to solve the state equations of the fluid mechanics problem. On the other hand, the finite element method is well adapted to the optimum design problems, since the mesh can well fit the boundary of the domain to optimize. We describe the optimization problem and the solution of the state equation in Chapter I.

The gradient optimization methods used are the steepest descent, which seems to be efficient ( see [1], [2] and [7] ) in a large category of optimum design problems and GMRES in order to solve the system of equations deduced from the optimality condition: gradient of cost functional = 0. Gradient methods are described in paragraph II.2 of Chapter II. The adjoint state equation is used in order to compute the gradient of the cost function in the application of these methods.

The optimization methods with no gradient computation are Powell's method and least squares method, since the functional to minimize is a sum of squares. This gives the idea to use also GMRES as a direct minimization procedure, since this method solves a system of equations by minimizing the residual norm over a Krylov subspace. The optimization methods with no gradient computation are described in paragraph II.3.

The purpose of this work is to compare these methods at their convergence behaviour and speed. We find the convergence curve and count the CPU time of every method. These are the comparison criteria and we can have an indication for the application of a certain method in more complicated problems. Numerical experiments and results are described in Chapter III.

Finally, we apply the method which behaves better in order to solve a lifting airfoil optimization problem. The problem is described in Chapter IV. The formulation and solution of the state equations and of the optimum design are given. Numerical results and comments are also presented.

## I. AN OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM

### I.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM

The optimization problem we treat here is the following:

*Find the nozzle which realizes a certain velocity distribution on its walls for an incompressible, two-dimensional, irrotational, steady flow*

More precisely, if we call:

- $\vec{v} = (v_1, v_2)$  a given velocity distribution we want to realize on the nozzle walls,
- $\vec{u} = (u_1, u_2)$  the velocity distribution of the flow,
- $\Gamma$  the boundary of the domain,
- $|\vec{x}|$  the Euclidian norm of  $\vec{x}$ ,

the Optimum Shape Design Problem is:

Find a boundary  $\Gamma$  such that the functional

$$(I.1.1) \quad E(\Gamma) = \int_{\Gamma} |\vec{u} - \vec{v}|^2 d\Gamma$$

is minimized.

### I.2 THE STATE EQUATION

Consider a two-dimensional flow, which in addition is incompressible and irrotational. We introduce the stream function  $\Psi$  such that the velocity at every point of the flow field is:

$$(I.2.1) \quad \vec{u} = \text{rot} \Psi = \left( \frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_2}, -\frac{\partial \Psi}{\partial x_1} \right)$$

so the mass continuity equation  $\text{div} \vec{u} = 0$  is identically satisfied.

Since  $\text{rot} \vec{u} = 0$ , (irrotational flow) the equation for  $\Psi$  is the Laplace equation

$$(I.2.2) \quad -\Delta \Psi = 0$$

The boundary conditions for  $\Psi$  will be: a) the flow velocity at the entrance and the exit of the nozzle is parallel to the nozzle axis (taken as axis  $x_1$ , see Figure I.2.1) and uniform

$$(I.2.3) \quad \Psi = u_0 \cdot x_2 + \text{constant}$$

b) the profile and the axis of the nozzle are streamlines.

Therefore,  $\Psi$  is the solution of the following equations:

$$(I.2.4) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta\Psi = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial\vec{n}}|_{\Gamma_1 \cup \Gamma_3} = 0 \\ \Psi|_{\Gamma_2} = 1 \\ \Psi|_{\Gamma_4} = 0 \end{cases}$$

where we suppose that  $u_0 \cdot L = 1$  (figure I.2.1).




Figure I.2.1

### I.3 THE OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM

The function to minimize is given by equation (I.1.1), where  $\Gamma$  is replaced by  $\Gamma_2$ . If we use (I.2.1), we obtain the formula:

$$(I.3.1) \quad E(\Gamma_2) = \int_{\Gamma_2} |\text{rot}\Psi - \vec{v}|^2 d\Gamma.$$

We remark that:

$$(I.3.2) \quad |\text{rot}\Psi - \vec{v}|^2 = |\text{grad}\Psi - \vec{c}|^2$$

with  $\vec{c} = (-v_2, v_1)$ .

Using (I.3.1) and (I.3.2), the functional to minimize becomes:

$$(I.3.3) \quad E(\Gamma_2) = \int_{\Gamma_2} |\text{grad}\Psi - \vec{c}|^2 d\Gamma.$$

So, the minimization problem is:

Find the boundary  $\Gamma_2$  which minimizes (I.3.3), with  $\Psi$  solution of (I.2.4).

#### I.4 VARIATIONAL FORMULATION AND DISCRETIZATION

Multiplying (I.2.3) by a test function  $w \in H^1(\Omega)$ , integrating on  $\Omega$  (Fig. I.2.1) and using Green's formula and (I.2.8), we obtain:

$$(I.4.1) \quad - \int_{\Omega} \Delta\Psi \cdot w dx = \int_{\Omega} \text{grad}\Psi \cdot \text{grad}w dx - \int_{\Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_4} \frac{\partial\Psi}{\partial\vec{n}} w ds = 0.$$

We conclude from (I.4.1) that  $\Psi$  is computed solving:

Find  $\Psi$  such that

$$(I.4.2) \quad \int_{\Omega} \text{grad}\Psi \cdot \text{grad}w dx = 0, \forall w \in V_0(\Omega)$$

$$\Psi - \Psi_0 \in V_0(\Omega)$$

where

$$V_0(\Omega) = \{\Psi \in H^1(\Omega) : \Psi = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_2 \cup \Gamma_4\}$$

and  $\Psi_0$  is an extension inside  $\Omega$  of the boundary condition

$$(I.4.3) \quad \Psi_0|_{\Gamma_2} = 1$$

We use the Finite Element Method (FEM) to solve (I.4.2). We discretize this equation using  $P^1$  triangular Finite Elements and we approach the solution  $\Psi$  by  $\Psi_h$  solution of the problem:

Find  $\Psi_h \in V_h(\Omega_h)$  that satisfies

$$(I.4.4) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \text{grad}\Psi_h \cdot \text{grad}w_h dx = 0, \forall w_h \in V_{0h}(\Omega_h)$$

where

$$V_h(\Omega_h) = \{w_h \in C^0(\Omega_h) : w_h|_{T_j} \in P^1\},$$

$$V_{0h}(\Omega_h) = \{w_h \in C^0(\Omega_h) : w_h|_{T_j} \in P^1, w_h = 0 \text{ on } \Gamma_{2h} \cup \Gamma_{4h}\}$$



and  $\Psi_h = \Psi_{0h}$  on  $\Gamma_{2h}$ .  $\Psi_{0h}$  is a discretized approximation of  $\Psi_0$ . We denote by  $\Gamma_{2h}$  and  $\Gamma_{4h}$  the discretized boundaries  $\Gamma_2$  and  $\Gamma_4$ , respectively and by  $T_j$  a triangle of the discretization  $\Omega_h$  of  $\Omega$ .

Then, we approach  $E(\Gamma_2)$  by  $E_h(\Gamma_{2h})$ :

$$(I.4.5) \quad E_h(\Gamma_{2h}) = \int_{A_h} |grad\Psi_h - \vec{c}|^2 dx$$

where

$$A_h = \{ \text{Triangles having one edge on } \Gamma_{2h} \}.$$

It is remarkable that we approach (I.3.3) by an integral on the elements adjacent to the discretized boundary, because the discrete gradient of  $\Psi$  ( $grad\Psi_h$ ) is piecewise constant (since we use  $P^1$  finite elements). If we call  $grad\Psi_{hi}$  the gradient of the solution on the  $i$ -th element and  $\vec{c}_i = \vec{c}|_{i\text{-th element}}$ , (I.4.5) gives:

$$(I.4.6) \quad E_h(\Gamma_{2h}) = \sum_{T_i \in A_h} |grad\Psi_{hi} - \vec{c}_i|^2 \cdot |T_i|$$

## I.5 THE DISCRETE FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM AND ITS CONSTRAINTS

The boundary  $\Gamma_{2h}$  is defined by the line through the points  $q_i$  that discretize the boundary  $\Gamma_2$ . The discrete optimization problem is:

$$(P.I.5) \quad \text{Find } q_i \text{ such that (I.4.6) is minimum with } \Psi_h \text{ solution of (I.4.4).}$$

The constraints for this problem are the following:

- a)  $q_{i1}$  is fixed
- b) the  $q_i \in \Gamma_{2h}$  are such that  $0 < q_{i2} < \infty$
- c)  $q_{i2}$  is constant at the exit.

We remark that constraint a) means that the unknowns of the problem are the ordinates of  $q_i \in \Gamma_{2h}$ .

## II. SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEM

The optimization problem described in I will be solved using gradient methods (Steepest Descent Algorithm and solution of the optimality condition  $grad E_h(\Gamma_{2h}) = 0$  with GMRES) and with methods with no gradient computation, namely GMRES, Powell's Method and Least Squares Method.

The linear system (I.4.4) is solved using the Finite Element Method (FEM) and this requires the construction of the Finite Element Mesh of  $\Omega$  (nozzle longitudinal section).

We describe in the following the construction of the mesh and the optimization methods.

## II.1 CONSTRUCTION OF THE MESH

The mesh of the nozzle is constructed by mapping the mesh of a rectangle onto  $\Omega_h$ .

The nozzle mesh is obtained by dilating the rectangle mesh on the  $x_2$  direction by a ratio  $l_i = \frac{q_{i2}-y_1}{y_2-y_1}$  on every line with  $x_1 = q_{i1}$  (see Fig. II.1.1 ). So, the discretization points of the nozzle mesh have the same abscissa as the rectangle mesh nodes and ordinates  $q_{k2} = y_1 + l_i \cdot (r_{k2} - y_1)$  where  $q_k$  corresponds to  $r_k$  on the rectangle. The element and node numbering is the same for the two meshes, only the nodes ordinates change.

The mesh construction is shown on the Figure II.1.1.




Figure II.1.1

## II.2 GRADIENT METHODS

It is known that for a continuously differentiable function  $E(z)$  with  $z \in R^N$  a necessary condition for having a minimum is that  $grad_z E(z) = 0$ . Gradient methods try to satisfy this condition.

Such methods can be used if we consider the functional given by (I.4.6) as a function of  $z \in R^N$  where

$$(II.2.1) \quad z = \begin{pmatrix} q_{12} \\ q_{22} \\ \vdots \\ q_{N2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} t_1 \\ t_2 \\ \vdots \\ t_N \end{pmatrix}$$

and  $q_i \in \Gamma_{2h}$ .

### II.2.1 COMPUTATION OF THE DISCRETE GRADIENT OF $E_h$

The computation of  $\text{grad}E_h$  must be done cheaply, that is by computing the function  $\Psi_h$  the least number of times.

We perform this computation in its discrete form. We need for this the two following propositions:

**Proposition II.2.1.1.** *Assume that  $f$  is a continuously differentiable function on  $T_j$ . If  $T'_j$  is obtained from  $T_j$  by moving a vertex  $q_k$  into  $q_k + \delta q_k$ , then*

$$\int_{T'_j \setminus T_j} f dx - \int_{T_j \setminus T'_j} f dx = \int_{T_j} \delta q_k \cdot \nabla(f w_k) dx + o(|\delta q_k|),$$

where  $w_k$  is the basis function associated with the vertex  $q_k$ .

**Proposition II.2.1.2.** *Let  $T'_j$  be the element obtained from  $T_j$  by moving a vertex  $q_k \in T_j$  into  $q_k + \delta q_k$ . If  $w_i$  is the basis function associated with the vertex  $q_i \in T_j$  and  $w'_i$  is the same basis function when  $q_k$  is replaced by  $q_k + \delta q_k$ , then*

$$w'_i(x) - w_i(x) = -w_k(x) \nabla w_i(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k + o(|\delta q_k|), \quad \forall x \in T_j \cap T'_j, \forall q_i, q_k \text{ vertices of } T_j$$

where  $w_k$  is the basis function associated with the vertex  $q_k$ .

These propositions are found in [1].

We prove in Appendix A that if we denote by  $q_{kl}, l = 1, 2$  the  $x_1$  and  $x_2$  coordinates of  $q_k$ , we have from (A.24)

$$(II.2.1.1) \quad \begin{aligned} \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial q_{kl}} &= \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla P_h) \frac{\partial \Psi_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) \\ &\quad + (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k) \frac{\partial P_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) - (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla P_h) \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l}] dx \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla w_k \frac{\partial \Psi_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) dx \\ &\quad + \int_{A_h} |\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}|^2 \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l} dx, \end{aligned}$$

where  $P_h$  is the solution of the adjoint equation (A.16).

We have found so far the  $\text{grad}E_h$  with respect to the coordinates of the nodes of  $\Omega_h$  as if these nodes moved independently. In fact, only the nodes on  $\Gamma_{2h}$  move independently and the other nodes follow this motion. So, we have to find the  $\text{grad}E_h$  with respect to the coordinates of these boundary nodes. In addition, nodes on  $\Gamma_{2h}$  move only on the  $x_2$  direction and the optimization parameters are the  $\{t_i, i = 1, 2, \dots, N\}$  of eq. (II.2.1). Therefore, we are interested in

$$(II.2.1.2) \quad \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial t_i} = \sum_{k,l} \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial q_{kl}} \cdot \frac{\partial q_{kl}}{\partial t_i} = \sum_k \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial q_{k2}} \cdot \frac{\partial q_{k2}}{\partial t_i}$$

since

$$\frac{\partial E_h}{\partial q_{k1}} = 0.$$

In order to compute  $\frac{\partial q_{k2}}{\partial t_i}$  we use the fact that the nozzle mesh is constructed by dilating the mesh of a rectangle, as described in II.1. Supposing that the edges of the rectangle parallel to  $x_1$  direction are  $x_2 = y_1$  and  $x_2 = y_2$  (see Fig. II.1.1) and denoting by  $r_{kl}, l = 1, 2$  the coordinates of the node in the rectangle mesh which corresponds to  $q_k$  we have

$$(II.2.1.3) \quad q_{k2} = y_1 + l_i \cdot (r_{k2} - y_1), \forall q_k \text{ such that } q_{k1} = q_{i1}$$

where  $l_i = \frac{t_i - y_1}{y_2 - y_1}$  the dilation ratio on the line  $x_1 = q_{i1}$ . From eq. (II.2.1.3) we see that

$$(II.2.1.4) \quad \frac{\partial q_{k2}}{\partial t_i} = \begin{cases} \frac{r_{k2} - y_1}{y_2 - y_1} & \text{if } q_{k1} = q_{i1} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

So, we have proved the

**Proposition II.2.1.3.** *The gradient of  $E_h$  is given by eq. (II.2.1.1), (II.2.1.2) and (II.2.1.4).*

We have to note that the computation of  $\text{grad}E_h$  by the use of the adjoint state equation is rather complicated. An alternative is to compute  $\text{grad}E_h$  by the finite difference method. More precisely, we may consider a  $\delta t_i$  for every  $t_i$  and to compute the solution  $\Psi'_h$  in the new domain  $\Omega'_h$ , where  $t_i$  is replaced by  $t_i + \delta t_i$ . Then, we compute

$$\frac{\partial E_h}{\partial t_i} = \frac{E'_h - E_h}{\delta t_i},$$

where  $E_h, E'_h$  are given by eq. (I.4.6) for  $\Psi_h, A_h$  and  $\Psi'_h, A'_h$ , respectively. The computation is simpler, but much more expensive since we must solve the state equation  $N$  times and not only one as we do by using the adjoint state equation.

## II.2.2 STEEPEST DESCENT METHOD

Suppose we want to find

$$\min_{z \in R^N} E(z).$$

From the relation

$$(II.2.2.1) \quad E(z + \delta z) = E(z) + \text{grad}E(z) \cdot \delta z + o(|\delta z|), \forall \delta z \in R^N,$$

we obtain for  $\delta z = -\rho \text{grad}E(z)$  with  $\rho$  a small positive number:

$$(II.2.2.2) \quad E(z + \delta z) = E(z) - \rho |\text{grad}E(z)|^2 + o(\rho |\text{grad}E(z)|).$$

Since  $\rho |\text{grad}E(z)|^2 > 0$  and  $o(\rho |\text{grad}E(z)|)$  can become very small, we see that using (II.2.2.2) we can make  $E(z + \delta z) < E(z)$ .

So, we conclude the following algorithm for minimizing  $E(z)$ :

### Algorithm II.2.2.1

- Choose  $z^0 \in R^N$ ,  $\rho > 0$  and  $\varepsilon \in R$
- For  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  (till satisfied) do
  - Compute  $h^k = -\text{grad}E(z^k)$
  - Compute  $\rho^k = \text{argmin} E(z^k + \rho h^k)$  with  $\rho > 0$
  - Set  $z^{k+1} = z^k + \rho^k h^k$
- If  $|\text{grad}E(z^{k+1})| \leq \varepsilon$ 
  - stop
- else  $k = k + 1$ .

**Theorem II.2.2.1.** *If  $E$  is continuously differentiable and bounded from below, then all accumulation points  $\hat{z}$  of the sequence  $z^k$  constructed by algorithm II.2.2.1 satisfy  $\text{grad}E(\hat{z}) = 0$ .*

A proof of this theorem can be found in [1].

## II.2.3 GENERALIZED MINIMAL RESIDUAL ALGORITHM (GMRES)

GMRES algorithm has initially been developed for solving a linear system  $Az = f$  by minimizing the residual norm over a Krylov subspace when the matrix  $A$  is not positive definite. We remind that when  $A$  is a square matrix and  $v$  a nonzero vector, the  $m$ -th Krylov subspace associated with  $A$  and  $v$  is defined by  $K_m \equiv \text{span}\{v, Av, A^2v, \dots, A^{m-1}v\}$ . A more generalized form of GMRES is for solving a non-linear system of equations  $F(z) = 0$ , with  $z, F \in R^N$ . GMRES algorithm is the following

### Algorithm II.2.3.1

- Choose  $z^0 \in R^N$
- For  $k = 0, 1, \dots$  do
  - Construct an orthonormal basis  $\{p_j\}_{j=1}^m$  of a Krylov subspace with  $p_1 = -F(z^k) / |F(z^k)|$  and whose dimension is  $m \ll N$
  - Form the new solution
 
$$z^{k+1} = z^k + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j p_j$$
 where the  $\alpha_j \in R$  are chosen to minimize  $|F(z^{k+1})|^2$
- If the solution is satisfactory
  - stop
- else  $k = k + 1$ .

The construction of the Krylov subspace orthonormal basis is done according to Arnoldi's orthogonalization method, as follows

### Algorithm II.2.3.2

- Set  $\hat{p}_1 = -F(z^k)$  and  $p_1 = \hat{p}_1 / |\hat{p}_1|$
- For  $j = 1, 2, \dots, m - 1$  do
  - compute
 
$$\hat{p}_{j+1} = \bar{F}(z^k; p_j) - \sum_{i=1}^j b_{ij} p_i$$
 where  $b_{ij} = \bar{F}(z^k; p_j) \cdot p_i$ 
 and

$$(II.2.3.1) \quad \bar{F}(z^k; p_j) = \lim_{\varepsilon \rightarrow 0} \frac{F(z^k + \varepsilon p_j) - F(z^k)}{\varepsilon}$$

- normalize  $p_{j+1} = \hat{p}_{j+1} / |\hat{p}_{j+1}|$
- end.

We remark that  $\bar{F}(z^k; p_j)$  is the action of the  $gradF(z^k)$  to  $p_j$  and the vectors  $p_j$  are such that  $p_j \cdot p_i = 0, \forall i = 1, 2, \dots, j-1$ . In Algorithm II.2.3.1 the minimization of  $|F(z^{k+1})|^2$  is done by solving a least squares problem obtained writing approximatively

$$(II.2.3.2) \quad |F(z^{k+1})|^2 \simeq |F(z^k) + \sum_{j=1}^m \alpha_j \bar{F}(z^k; p_j)|^2.$$

If this minimization is not satisfactory, an “exact” minimization of  $|F(z^{k+1})|^2$  is performed, without making the approximation (II.2.3.2). The criteria according to which a solution is satisfactory are the following

a)  $|F(z^k)| < \varepsilon_1 |F(z^0)|$

or

b) the norm of the projected  $gradF$  in the Krylov subspace is less than  $\varepsilon_2$  i.e.

$$|F(z^k)| \cdot \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^m (\bar{F}(z^k; p_j) \cdot F(z^k))} < \varepsilon_2$$

or

c) the relative difference norm  $|z^{k+1} - z^k| / |z^k|$  between two successive solutions is less than  $\varepsilon_3$

where  $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \varepsilon_3$  are three tolerances given to the algorithm.

GMRES has certain important properties which make it fast and robust. We summarize them in the following Propositions:

**Proposition II.2.3.1.** *The solution  $z^k$  of  $F(z) = 0$  found by Algorithm II.2.3.1 in the step  $k$  is exact if and only if the following equivalent conditions hold:*

- The algorithm breaks down at step  $k$
- $\hat{p}_{k+1} = 0$
- The degree of the minimal polynomial of the initial residual vector  $-F(z^0)$  is equal to  $k$ .

**Proposition II.2.3.2.** *The residual norm of the approximate solution  $z^k$  is equal to the  $(k+1)$ st component of the right-hand side of the linear system corresponding to the Least Squares Problem obtained by the minimization of eq. (II.2.3.2).*

The prooves of these propositions are in [5].

One more advantage of GMRES is that only the action of  $\text{grad}F$  to a vector is needed, not the computation of  $\text{grad}F$  and this can be done easily using finite differences according to eq. (II.2.3.1).

We remind that for the minimization problem (P.I.5) we use GMRES to solve the system derived from the optimality condition  $\text{grad}E_h$  that is we put  $F = \text{grad}E_h$ .

## II.3 METHODS WITH NO GRADIENT COMPUTATION

The computation of  $\text{grad}E_h$  and of the optimal step size in gradient methods are usually difficult to program. Therefore, we propose certain optimization methods which do not need the gradient of the functional to minimize.

These methods are described in the following.

### II.3.1 GMRES AS A MINIMIZATION TOOL

Assume that we have a function

$$(II.3.1.1) \quad F: R^N \mapsto R^N$$

whose norm is to be minimized, that is we have the optimization problem

$$(P.II.3.1.1) \quad \text{Find } \min_{z \in R^N} |F(z)|^2.$$

In order to solve this problem, we can use GMRES as described in Algorithm II.2.3.1 substituting the vector  $F$  of the non-linear system of equations by the function given of eq. (II.3.1.1). Then,  $|F(z)|^2$  is minimized over the Krylov subspace constructed in every step of GMRES algorithm considered as a function of the scalars  $\alpha_j$  that project the solution on the subspace.

We are able to use GMRES in this way if we construct a vector  $F \in R^N$  whose  $i$ -th component is

$$(II.3.1.2) \quad F_i = \sqrt{|\nabla \Psi_{hi} - \tilde{c}_i|^2 \cdot |T_i|}$$

so  $|F|^2 = E_h$ .

Evidently, using GMRES with no gradient computation has the same advantages mentioned in II.2.3. We would like however to remark that the linearized solution obtained by minimizing the approximated  $|F(z)|^2$  given by eq. (II.2.3.2) is usually sufficient when  $\min |F(z)|^2 = 0$  but this minimization isn't sufficient otherwise – that is  $|F(z)|^2$  must be minimized exactly and it is usually costly. This is due to the fact that GMRES solves a system  $F(z) = 0$ , by minimizing  $|F(z)|^2$  on a Krylov subspace even if  $|F(z)|^2 \neq 0$ . In this case we cannot write that  $F(z) = 0$ .



### II.3.2 POWELL' S METHOD

We consider a function  $f: R^N \mapsto R$  and we want to find

$$(P.II.3.2.1) \quad \min_{z \in R^N} f(z).$$

The outline of Powell's method for solving (P.II.3.2.1) is the following:

- Choose a point  $z \in R^N$  and a direction  $x \in R^N$
- Find  $\min_{\lambda \in R} f(z + \lambda x)$  and set  $z = z + \lambda x$
- Choose a new direction  $x \in R^N$  and solve the previous minimization problem.

The idea of the method looks simple, since it deals with one dimensional minimization. All methods using the above described principle of one dimensional minimization choose the directions according to one of the following criteria:

a) the used directions must be taken parallel to the eigenvector corresponding to the largest eigenvalue of  $f$

or

b) they must be such that minimization along one of them must not affect minimization along the other directions. Most methods satisfy condition b), which implies

$$(II.3.2.1) \quad \vec{u}.H.\vec{v} = 0$$

for two different directions  $\vec{u}$  and  $\vec{v}$  passing through point  $z$ .  $H$  denotes the Hessian matrix of  $f$  at point  $z$ , that is the matrix whose elements are

$$(II.3.2.2) \quad H_{ij} = \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(z).$$

We can prove eq. (II.3.2.1) taking the Taylor's expansion of  $f(z)$  considering  $z$  as the origin of a coordinates system  $\{x_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$

$$(II.3.2.3) \quad \begin{aligned} f(x) &= f(z) + \sum_i \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_i} x_i + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} x_i x_j + o(|\delta x|^2) \\ &\simeq c - g.x + \frac{1}{2} x.H.x \end{aligned}$$

where  $c = f(z)$ ,  $g = -\nabla f(z)$ . We see from eq. (II.3.2.3) that  $\nabla f(x) = H.x - g$  and

$$(II.3.2.4) \quad \delta(\nabla f) = H.\delta x.$$

Condition b) means that  $\delta(\nabla f)$  must stay perpendicular to the direction  $\vec{u}$  when minimization along direction  $\vec{v}$  is performed. According to eq. (II.3.2.4) this changement equals to  $H.\vec{v}$  and since it must be perpendicular to  $\vec{u}$ , eq. (II.3.2.1) must be satisfied. Directions satisfying eq. (II.3.2.1) are called conjugate directions.

Powell's method constructs a set of mutually conjugate directions (directions that satisfy eq. (II.3.2.1) pairwise) and minimizes  $f$  along them:

### Algorithm II.3.2.1

- Initialize:  $\{\vec{u}_i = \vec{e}_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$   
where  $\vec{e}_i$  are the unit vectors on the  $N$  directions
- (1) • Choose the initial point  $z^0$ 
  - For  $i = 1, \dots, N$  do
    - Find  $\min_{\lambda \in R} f(z^{i-1} + \lambda \vec{u}_i)$
    - Set  $z_i = z_{i-1} + \lambda \vec{u}_i$  and  $\vec{u}_i = \lambda \vec{u}_i$
  - end
  - For  $i = 1, \dots, N - 1$  do
    - Set  $\vec{u}_i = \vec{u}_{i+1}$
  - end
  - Set  $\vec{u}_N = z^N - z^0$
  - Find  $\min_{\lambda \in R} f(z^N + \lambda \vec{u}_N)$
  - Set  $z^0 = z^N + \lambda \vec{u}_N$  and  $\vec{u}_N = \lambda \vec{u}_N$
  - If  $\min_z f(z)$  is found
    - stop
  - else go to (1)

Powell proved (cf [8]) the following

**Proposition II.3.2.1.** *Assume that  $f: R^N \rightarrow R$  is a quadratic function. Then,  $m$  iterations of Algorithm II.3.2.1 produce a set of directions  $\vec{u}_i$  whose last  $m$  members are mutually conjugate.*

We deduce the

**Corollary II.3.2.1**  *$N$  iterations of Algorithm II.3.2.1 (that is  $N.(N+1)$  one dimensional minimizations) take exactly to the minimum of a quadratic form.*

Powell's method has the advantage to converge quadratically. Algorithm II.3.2.1 however has the disadvantage to tend producing linearly dependent vectors because  $\vec{u}_N$  is replaced by  $\vec{u}_N = z^N - z^0$ , so the directions used are not mutually conjugate any more. In this case the minimum of  $f(z)$  is found over a subspace of  $R^N$ . This problem is handled by trying to find some "good" directions of descent instead of  $N$  mutually conjugate directions, but the quadratic convergence is spoiled. Effectively, the fundamental procedure is not changed, but we replace by  $z^N - z^0$  the old direction on which  $f$  decreased the most. It is done because the largest decrease direction is likely to be a major component of the direction we add. So, replacing it avoids a linear dependence.

However, there are some exceptions at this rule. The previous set of directions is kept if one of the following conditions is satisfied (denoting by  $f_0 = f(z^0)$ ,  $f_N = f(z^N)$ ,  $f_E = f(2z^N - z^0)$ ,  $\delta f$  = absolute value of the largest decrease of  $f$ )

a)  $f_E \geq f_0$  because  $z^N - z^0$  is not satisfactory

b)  $2(f_0 - 2f_N + f_E)[(f_0 - f_N) - \delta f]^2 \geq (f_0 - f_E)^2 \delta f$  because the decrease on  $z^N - z^0$  is not due to decrease on a direction or we have the indication - by the second derivatives - that we are at the minimum on the direction  $z^N - z^0$ .

The modified algorithm is used to solve (P.I.5) when  $f$  is given by eq. (I.4.6). The one dimensional minimization on every direction is performed using Brent's method. Brent's method minimizes a single variable function using the golden section search (see [3]) when the function is not smooth or a parabolic extrapolation otherwise (observing that a sufficiently smooth function is almost parabolic around its minimum). A detailed description of Brent's method and of golden section search is given in [3].

### II.3.3 LEAST SQUARES METHOD

We observe that the functional  $E_h$  to minimize, given by eq. (I.4.6), is a sum of squares. Therefore, it can be minimized by solving directly a Least Squares Problem. We describe the Least Squares Problem in its general form:

(P.II.3.3) given a matrix  $A$  of dimensions  $M \times N$  ( $M > N$ ) and a vector  $b$  with  $M$  components, find a vector  $z$  of  $N$  components which minimizes  $|Az - b|^2$ .

If the chosen norm is the euclidian norm, the solution of problem (P.II.3.3) verifies a linear system of equations according to the following theorem:

**Theorem II.3.3.1** *The vector  $z \in R^N$  solves (P.II.3.3) if and only if it is solution of the linear system:*

$$(II.3.3.1) \quad A^t A z = A^t b.$$

*This system has always at least one solution and if  $A^t A$  is non-singular the solution is unique.*

We refer to [9] for a proof of this theorem.

The system (II.3.3.1) is solved by applying a  $Q \cdot R$  factorization of the matrix  $A$  where  $Q$  is orthogonal with dimensions  $M \times N$  and  $R$  superior triangular of dimension  $N$ . If we

write the equality  $A = Q \cdot R$  by columns, we have for the  $i$ -th column of  $A$ :

$$(II.3.3.2) \quad a_i = \sum_{j=1}^N q_j r_{j,i} = \sum_{j=1}^i r_{j,i} q_j \implies r_{i,i} q_i = a_i - \sum_{j=1}^{i-1} r_{j,i} q_j,$$

where  $q_j$  are the columns of  $Q$ . We verify from eq. (II.3.3.2) that the vector  $q_j$  is a linear combination of  $a_1, a_2, \dots, a_j$ , therefore the vectors  $q_j$  may be constructed by the Gram-Schmidt orthonormalization procedure ( see Algorithm II.2.3.2 for a more general case of a non-linear system ).

Thus, the matrix  $A^t A$  is written:

$$(II.3.3.3) \quad A^t A = R^t Q^t Q R = R^t R = \bar{R}^t \bar{R}$$

where  $\bar{R}$  is the non-zero part of  $R$ . This factorization of  $A^t A$  is similar to a Cholesky factorization. We can obtain a factorization of  $A$  by the applying Givens' transformation, that is by multiplying successively  $A$  by matrices of elementary plane rotations. We refer to [9] for a detailed description of Givens' transformation and for the programming of the factorization. We note that the factorization of  $A$  gives immediately the solution of the Least Squares Problem, because:

$$(II.3.3.4) \quad |Ax - b|^2 = |QRx - b|^2 = |Rx - Q^t b|^2 = |\bar{R}x - c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2,$$

so any vector  $x$  verifying  $\bar{R}x = c_1$  realizes the minimum of  $|Ax - b|^2$ . We remark that the solution is unique when  $\deg(A) = N$  and is easily obtained since  $\bar{R}$  is upper triangular. If  $\deg(A) < N$  there is an infinity of solutions. In this case, the solution of minimal norm is proved to be again the solution of  $\bar{R}x = c_1$ .

The optimization problem (P.I.5) has been solved using an appropriate subroutine containing the Least Squares Method of Harwell Computer Library, considering  $E_h$  as the euclidian norm of a function  $F: R^N \mapsto R^N$ , given by (II.3.1.2) which is sum of a squares.

### III. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

#### III.1 PROBLEMS TREATED

The optimization problem (P.I.5) has been solved in two cases:

a) Inverse Problem

The velocity distribution  $\vec{c}$  on the boundary  $\Gamma_{2h}$  is produced by a known nozzle, i.e. having a given nozzle we solve the state equations (I.2.4) on the corresponding  $\Omega$  and we derive the velocity distribution on  $\Gamma_{2h}$ . In this case  $\min E_h = 0$ .

The different optimization methods are tested to find the known boundary and we are interested in the convergence speed of every method.

b) Real Problem

The velocity distribution  $\vec{c}$  is arbitrary. The nozzle which realizes it is not known. In this case we cannot assert that  $\min E_h = 0$ .

The methods are tested to find a nozzle that has this velocity distribution on its profile and we are also interested in the convergence speed of every method.

#### III.2 RESULTS

For every method used we have counted the number of solutions of the state equations (solution of  $-\Delta\Psi = 0$ ), which is the main computing cost, and the corresponding functional value. The CPU time is counted too.

For all tests, the nozzle section ( $\Omega$ ) has been discretized by 250 elements and 156 nodes and the unknown boundary  $\Gamma_{2h}$  has been discretized by 26 points. For Powell's method only 13 optimization parameters have been used corresponding to the odd numbered vertical coordinates of the discretization points on  $\Gamma_{2h}$ , because with 25 optimization parameters this method needs an excessively big CPU time.

In order to see how the convergence and the CPU time of every method varies when the number of the optimization points varies, we have done the same tests with two more values of optimization parameters: 51 discretization points on  $\Gamma_{2h}$  (which implies 50 optimization points), 900 elements and 510 mesh nodes; 15 discretization points on  $\Gamma_{2h}$ , that is 14 optimization parameters, 90 elements and 140 mesh nodes. For Powell's method only the latter test has been done, as it would be useless to perform the test with 50 optimization parameters.

The following figures show the results.

### III.3 Comments and Conclusion

Diagrams III.3.1, III.3.6 and III.3.9 show the convergence curves for an Inverse Problem and that GMRES has a fast convergence in both cases of use: without gradient computation and used for the solution of the optimality condition. This is due to the fact that GMRES converges quickly when it is used to solve a system  $F(z) = 0$ . Effectively, this is done in both cases of use and is expected to work well since  $\min E_h = 0$ .

The Steepest Descent Method has also worked quite well, especially in the beginning of the optimization procedure. This result was expected too, as it is known from numerical experiments ( cf [1] and [7] ) that this method is efficient when the Adjoint State Equation is used to compute the gradient of the cost functional.

The Least Squares Method has a rather slow convergence, mainly in the beginning of the procedure and it converges abruptly after a certain number of iterations. We see the expected form of the convergence of this method.

Powell's method is slow even for a small number of optimization parameters and this can be foreseen by the application of Corollary II.3.2.1. Diagram III.3.2 shows the convergence of Powell's method for an Inverse Problem and a Real Problem when 25 optimization parameters are used. Clearly, the method is too expensive, that's why it has not been tested in the two other cases of discretization.

The profile convergence shows that the prescribed boundary is well found by all methods. Certain methods, however, give oscillating profiles during the optimization procedure and mainly at the beginning ( for example Steepest Descent Powell's method ). We remark that GMRES and Least Squares Method give practically not oscillating profiles. We show in Diagram III.3.3 the boundary convergence for GMRES.

For the Real Problem, we see at Diagrams III.3.4, III.3.7 and III.3.10 that the gradient methods ( Steepest Descent and Gradient-GMRES ) find practically the same minimal value of the cost functional. Powell's method converges to the same value too. GMRES with no gradient computation and Least Squares Method converge rather slowly to a higher value (for GMRES is almost twice the value found by the gradient methods).

We remark the expected convergence of Steepest Descent and a good convergence of Gradient-GMRES. We note the fast convergence of Gradient-GMRES, especially when the number of optimization points increases. This result is expected, because of the efficiency of GMRES in solving fast systems of equations. GMRES with no gradient computation has a rather slow convergence, because the algorithm still solves a system  $F(z) = 0$  (we remind that  $F$  has the components given by eq. (II.3.1.2)), so  $|F(z)|$  and  $\min |F(z)|$  are forced to be zero at the solution  $z$ , while  $\min E_h = \min |F(z)|^2 \neq 0$ .

The Least Squares Method is slow again while Powell's method is better than in the inverse problem but still slow compared with the Steepest Descent and GMRES in its both cases of use.

The converged boundaries obtained by every method (Diagrams III.3.5, III.3.8 and III.3.11) show that all methods, except the Least Squares Method, converge to the same profile, that is they find practically the same minimum of the cost functional.

The Least Squares Method gives an oscillating final boundary and this is rather bad, because it implies that we have to use constraints and smoothing of the boundary (not use all the boundary discretization points as optimization points). We remind that boundary smoothing has been used for Powell's method.

Finally, we can observe the efficiency of every method, regarding its computing cost, from Diagrams III.3.12 and III.3.13. Diagram III.3.12 shows the number of solutions of the State Equation as a function of the optimization points for an Inverse Problem. We deduce that for GMRES in both cases of use, the number of solutions of the State Equation increases a little when the number of optimization parameters increases. More precisely, when the number of optimization points is rather little, GMRES needs almost the same number of Laplacian solutions till the convergence. If the number of optimization points is high the computing cost increases remarkably when it is used with no gradient computation: when we double the optimization parameters the cost is more than double. We don't have the same effect however when Gradient-GMRES is used: doubling the optimization points increases the cost less than the double. This is also due to the efficiency of GMRES when the number of unknowns is big.

We can see the same effect in the Steepest Descent when the number of parameters is high, but we can also observe its sensitivity when the number of optimization parameters is low: the computing cost is more than double when we don't even double the optimization points. We can explain this fact with the observation that the solution of the State Equation and the Gradient of the Cost Function are better approximated when we use a better discretization.

Least Squares Method has almost the same behaviour as GMRES with no gradient computation: the computing cost doesn't increase proportionally to the number of the optimization points if this is low but it increases proportionally when we increase the optimization points to higher numbers.

In the case of a Real Problem, we see that Steepest Descent and Gradient-GMRES have the same behaviour as for the Inverse Problem. This is due to the fact that these methods work in the same way in both cases.

GMRES with no gradient computation changes its effects, especially when the number of optimization parameters is high. GMRES doesn't increase proportionally the computing cost. Least Squares Method increases it rather much.

We can conclude that the method of Gradient-GMRES is an efficient one in both kinds of problems. If, however, we have to treat a problem where the minimum is equal to zero, we can use GMRES with no gradient computation. In addition, in this case we have the advantage of not computing the gradient, which is complicated as we have seen.




Diagram III.3.1: Nozzle optimization with 25 optimization parameters. Convergence comparison for an inverse problem.




Diagram III.3.2: Nozzle optimization with 25 optimization parameters using Powell's method for an inverse and a real problem.




Diagram III.3.3: Nozzle optimization with 25 optimization parameters. Boundary convergence for GMRES.




Diagram III.3.4: Nozzle optimization with 25 optimization parameters. Convergence comparison for a real problem.






Diagram III.3.5: Nozzle optimization with 25 optimization parameters. Converged boundaries for a real problem.




Diagram III.3.6: Nozzle optimization with 14 optimization parameters. Convergence comparison for an inverse problem.




Diagram III.3.7: Nozzle optimization with 14 optimization parameters. Convergence comparison for a real problem.




Diagram III.3.8: Nozzle optimization with 14 optimization parameters. Converged boundaries for a real problem.




Diagram III.3.9: Nozzle optimization with 50 optimization parameters. Convergence comparison for an inverse problem.




Diagram III.3.10: Nozzle optimization with 50 optimization parameters. Convergence comparison for a real problem.




Diagram III.3.11: Nozzle optimization with 50 optimization parameters. Converged boundaries for a real problem.




Diagram III.3.13: Computing cost vs the number of optimization parameters for a real problem.




Diagram III.3.12: Computing cost vs the number of optimization parameters for an inverse problem.

## IV. APPLICATION IN THE OPTIMIZATION OF LIFTING BODIES

### IV.1 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROBLEM AND OF THE STATE EQUATIONS

The optimization problem has the same formulation as in I.1:

*Find the lifting airfoil that achieves a certain velocity distribution on its boundary in an incompressible, two-dimensional, irrotational and steady flow.*

We remind that this problem consists to find a boundary  $\Gamma$  which minimizes the functional

$$(IV.1.1) \quad E(\Gamma) = \int_{\Gamma} |\vec{u} - \vec{v}|^2 d\Gamma$$

with the notation of I.1.

The flow is modelled in terms of the potential  $\phi$ , that is we write

$$\vec{u} = \text{grad} \phi$$

at every point (since  $\text{rot} \vec{u} = 0$ ) and by the continuity equation ( $\text{div} \vec{u} = 0$ ) we deduce that

$$(IV.1.2) \quad \Delta \phi = 0 \text{ in } \Omega.$$

Now, the flow domain is infinite, but we approximate it by a finite domain  $\Omega$  (see Figure IV.1.1), whose "infinite" boundary  $\Gamma_{\infty}$  is sufficiently big compared to the airfoil boundary  $\Gamma_c$ . The speed is considered uniform at  $\Gamma_{\infty}$  with a certain incidence  $\theta$  and equal to  $\vec{u}_{\infty}$ , so the boundary condition on it is

$$(IV.1.3) \quad \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} |_{\Gamma_{\infty}} = \vec{u}_{\infty} \cdot \vec{n}.$$

The flow slips on the airfoil, therefore we have

$$(IV.1.4) \quad \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} |_{\Gamma_c} = 0.$$

In addition, as the trailing edge  $P$  is a singularity of  $\Gamma_c$ ,  $|\nabla \phi(x)|$  becomes infinite when  $x \rightarrow P$  and therefore

$$(IV.1.5) \quad \text{rot} \vec{u} = \omega \delta_{\Sigma},$$

where  $\omega$  is constant and  $\delta_{\Sigma}$  is Dirac's function on the streamline  $\Sigma$  from  $P$ . The discretization of (IV.1.5) is difficult, so we formulate the state equations on  $\Omega - \Sigma$  and we replace it by the condition

$$(IV.1.6) \quad \phi |_{\Sigma^+} - \phi |_{\Sigma^-} = \alpha.$$

We derive (IV.1.6) by integrating the equation  $\frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \sigma} |_{\Sigma+} = \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial \sigma} |_{\Sigma-}$  which expresses the continuity of  $\vec{u}$  through  $\Sigma$ . It is proved that (IV.1.6) is independent from the line  $\Sigma$  (which is not known) in the two dimensional case. The constant  $\alpha$  is computed by solving Joukowski's condition

$$(IV.1.7) \quad |\nabla \phi(P^+)|^2 = |\nabla \phi(P^-)|^2$$

(see Fig. IV.1.1 for  $P^+$  and  $P^-$ ). The discontinuity of  $\phi$  on  $\Sigma$  implies a circulation around the airfoil, which causes a lift equal to  $F_L = \alpha \rho |\vec{u}_\infty|^2$ . Finally, in order to have a unique solution for  $\phi$ , we must determine its value on a point. So, we add the condition

$$(IV.1.8) \quad \phi(P) = 0, P = \text{trailing edge.}$$




Figure IV.1.1

Therefore, the state equations for  $\phi$  are

$$(IV.1.9) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta \phi = 0 \text{ in } \Omega - \Sigma \\ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} |_{\Gamma_\infty} = \vec{u}_\infty \cdot \vec{n} \\ \frac{\partial \phi}{\partial n} |_{\Gamma_c} = 0 \\ \phi |_{\Sigma+} - \phi |_{\Sigma-} = \alpha \\ |\nabla \phi(P^+)|^2 = |\nabla \phi(P^-)|^2 \\ \phi(P) = 0 \end{cases}$$

In order to solve (IV.1.9), we decompose  $\phi$ :  $\phi = \phi_0 + \alpha \phi_1$ , where the non-lifting potential  $\phi_0$  is computed by solving the following system

$$(IV.1.10) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta \phi_0 = 0 \text{ in } \Omega \\ \frac{\partial \phi_0}{\partial n} |_{\Gamma_\infty} = \vec{u}_\infty \cdot \vec{n} \\ \frac{\partial \phi_0}{\partial n} |_{\Gamma_c} = 0 \\ \phi_0(P) = 0 \end{cases}$$

and the discontinuous potential  $\phi_1$  is the solution of

$$(IV.1.11) \quad \begin{cases} -\Delta\phi_1 = 0 \text{ in } \Omega - \Sigma \\ \frac{\partial\phi_1}{\partial n} |_{\Gamma_\epsilon \cup \Gamma_\infty} = 0 \\ \phi_1 |_{\Sigma^+} - \phi_1 |_{\Sigma^-} = 1 \\ \phi_1(P) = 0 \end{cases}$$

The constant  $\alpha$  is then computed by solving the equation obtained by Joukowski's condition.

## IV.2 VARIATIONAL FORMULATION AND DISCRETIZATION

The variational formulation of (IV.1.10), obtained by applying Green's formula and taking into account the boundary conditions, is

find  $\phi_0 \in V_0(\Omega)$  such that

$$(IV.2.1) \quad \int_{\Omega} \text{grad}\phi_0 \cdot \text{grad}w \, dx = \int_{\Gamma_\infty} \vec{u}_\infty \cdot \vec{n} \, d\gamma, \forall w \in V_0(\Omega)$$

where  $V_0(\Omega) = \{w \in H^1(\Omega), w(P) = 0\}$ .

In the same way, we obtain the variational formulation for (IV.1.11)

find  $\phi_1 \in W$  such that

$$(IV.2.2) \quad \int_{\hat{\Omega}} \text{grad}\phi_1 \cdot \text{grad}w \, dx = 0, \forall w \in V'$$

where

$$\hat{\Omega} = \text{interior}(\bar{\Omega} - \Sigma), V' = \{w \in H^1(\hat{\Omega}), w(P) = 0, w |_{\Sigma^+} - w |_{\Sigma^-} = \beta, \beta \text{ any constant}\},$$

$$W = \{w \in V', w |_{\Sigma^+} - w |_{\Sigma^-} = 1\}.$$

The discretization of (IV.2.1) and (IV.2.2) is done by  $P^1$  triangular finite elements. Denoting by the subscript  $h$  the discretized approximations of domains, boundaries (the construction of the mesh is discussed later) and discrete solutions, we have the discretized form of (IV.2.1)

find  $\phi_{0h} \in V_{0h}$  such that

$$(IV.2.3) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \text{grad}\phi_{0h} \cdot \text{grad}w_h \, dx = \int_{\Gamma_{\infty h}} \vec{u}_{\infty h} \cdot \vec{n} \, d\gamma, \forall w_h \in V_{0h}$$

where  $V_{0h} = \{w_h \in C^0(\Omega_h) : w_h |_{T_k} \in P^1 \text{ and } w_h(P) = 0\}$ .

The discretized form of (IV.2.2) is

find  $\phi_{1h} \in W_h$  such that

$$(IV.2.4) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \text{grad} \phi_{1h} \cdot \text{grad} w_h dx = 0, \forall w_h \in V_{0h}$$

where

$$W_h = \{w_h \in C^0(\bar{\Omega}_h) : w_h|_{T_k} \in P^1, w_h(P) = 0, w_h|_{\Sigma^+} - w_h|_{\Sigma^-} = 1\}.$$

In order to solve Joukowski's condition in the discrete case, we consider the gradient of the solution restrained in the triangles which have one edge on the airfoil boundary and contain P (see Fig. IV.2.1), since  $\text{grad} \phi$  is piecewise constant. We use Newton's method for solving the non-linear equation obtained from (IV.1.7).

The airfoil boundary is constructed using a cubic spline which passes through certain control points and has given derivatives at the leading and at the trailing edge. The domain  $\Omega_h$  is automatically meshed using Voronoi's method if  $\Gamma_{ch}$ ,  $\Gamma_{\infty h}$  and  $\Sigma_h$  are discretized.

The functional to minimize is approximated, as in the case of the nozzle optimization, by an integral on the triangles having one edge on the boundary to optimize (see eq. (I.4.5)) with  $\Gamma_{2h}$  replaced by  $\Gamma_{ch}$ ,  $\Psi_h$  by  $\phi_h$  and  $\vec{c}$  by  $\vec{v}_h$ .




Figure IV.2.1

### IV.3 SOLUTION OF THE OPTIMIZATION PROBLEM

The initial choice of the optimization parameters is the ordinates of the spline control points and the angles of the airfoil at the trailing edge P. We note that the leading and trailing edge are control points for the spline but they are fixed, that is their ordinates are not optimization parameters. In order to prevent the optimization points to cross, we must add bound constraints in the optimization procedure. Such a treatment would give complex programming, so it is desired to transform the constrained optimization problem to unconstrained. This is done in the following way: suppose that the parameter  $v_i \in [a_i, b_i]$ . We map the interval  $[a_i, b_i]$  to  $[-1, 1]$ , so  $v_i$  is mapped to  $p_i = 2 \frac{(v_i - a_i)}{(b_i - a_i)} - 1$ . Then we optimize with respect to  $t_i = \arccos(p_i)$  with no constraints as  $p_i = \cos(t_i) \in [-1, 1]$ .

The optimization method used is GMRES for solving the optimality condition:  $\text{grad} E_h = 0$ . We have also used GMRES with no gradient computation for comparison. We give the computation of the gradient.

Since the functional is the same as in the case of the nozzle optimization, eq. (A.3) is still valid if we replace the stream function  $\Psi_h$  by the potential  $\phi_h$  and the distribution  $\vec{c}$  by the desired velocity distribution  $\vec{v}_h$ . In order to introduce again an adjoint equation, we have to differentiate the state equations (IV.1.9). We need for that a discrete variational formulation of (IV.1.9). According to Angrand (cf [7]) we have that the solution of (IV.1.9) is approximated by the solution of the system

find  $\phi_h \in V'_h$  such that

$$(IV.3.1) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = \int_{\Gamma_{\infty h}} \vec{u}_{\infty h} \cdot \vec{n} w_h d\gamma, \quad \forall w_h \in V_{0h}$$

where

$$V'_h = \{w_h \in C^0(\dot{\Omega}_h) : w_h|_{T_k} \in P^1, w_h(P) = 0, w_h|_{\Sigma_h^+} - w_h|_{\Sigma_h^-} = \alpha, \\ |\nabla \phi_h(P^+)|^2 = |\nabla \phi_h(P^-)|^2\}.$$

Considering two different configurations  $\Gamma_c$  and  $\Gamma'_c$  of the airfoil boundary we have on the two corresponding domains  $\Omega_h$  and  $\Omega'_h$

$$(IV.3.2) \quad \int_{\Omega'_h} \nabla \phi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h dx - \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = 0$$

since the boundary  $\Gamma_{\infty h}$  is fixed. So, if we note again

$$(IV.3.3) \quad \delta J_{T_j} = \int_{T'_j} \nabla \phi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h dx - \int_{T_j} \nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx$$

we obtain

$$(IV.3.4) \quad \sum_j \delta J_{T_j} = \sum_j \int_{T'_j} \nabla \phi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h dx - \sum_j \int_{T_j} \nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = 0.$$

Therefore, eq. (A.14), (A.15) and (A.16) are still valid with the appropriate substitutions and if we take into account the discontinuity of  $\phi_h$  on  $\Sigma_h$  in the computation of  $grad \phi_h$  on the triangles on both sides of  $\Sigma_h$ . We can again perform the same gradient computation as in Appendix A.

Thus, the gradient of the cost functional with respect to the coordinates of the nodes is

$$(IV.3.5) \quad \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial q_{kl}} = \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla P_h) \frac{\partial \phi_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) \\ + (\nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla w_k) \frac{\partial P_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) - (\nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla P_h) \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l}] dx \\ - 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \phi_h - \vec{v}_h) \cdot \nabla w_k \frac{\partial \phi_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) dx \\ + \int_{A_h} |\nabla \phi_h - \vec{v}_h|^2 \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l} dx \text{ with } l = 1, 2$$



and  $P_h$  the solution of the adjoint equation  
find  $P_h \in V_{0h}$  such that

$$(IV.3.6) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla P_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \phi_h - \tilde{v}_h) \cdot \nabla w_h dx, \forall w_h \in V_{0h}.$$

Then, the gradient with respect to  $z_i$  (ordinates of the optimization points) is

$$(IV.3.7) \quad \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial z_i} = \sum_{k,l} \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial q_{kl}} \cdot \frac{\partial q_{kl}}{\partial z_i}.$$

In this case the derivative  $\frac{\partial q_{kl}}{\partial z_i}$  is not analytically known, but is computed numerically using the finite difference method: we suppose that the optimization points  $i=1,2,\dots,N$  move on the  $x_2$  direction by  $\delta z_i$  and we compute the displacements of all the mesh nodes according to the expression

$$(IV.3.8) \quad \delta q_k = \frac{1}{s_k} \sum_{i=1}^N w_i s_{ik} \delta z_i$$

where  $w_i$  is a weight function (for example in the two dimensional case we can consider the sum of the lengths of the edges on both sides of point  $i$ ),  $s_{ik} = \frac{1}{d_{ik}^\beta}$  with  $d_{ik}$ =distance of points  $i$  and  $k$  and  $\beta$  constant  $\geq 2$  and  $s_k$  normalization factor naturally taken equal to  $\sum_{i=1}^N w_i s_{ik}$ . So,  $\frac{\partial q_{kl}}{\partial z_i} = \frac{\delta q_{kl}}{\delta z_i}$ . The gradient with respect to the optimization parameters  $t_i$  is

$$(IV.3.9) \quad \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial t_i} = \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial z_i} \cdot \frac{\partial z_i}{\partial p_i} \cdot \frac{\partial p_i}{\partial t_i}$$

with  $\frac{\partial z_i}{\partial p_i} = .5(b_i - a_i)$  and  $\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial t_i} = -\sin(t_i)$ , when  $t_i \in [a_i, b_i]$ . We have proved the

**Proposition IV.3.1** *The gradient of the cost functional  $E_h$  is given by the equations (IV.3.5), (IV.3.6), (IV.3.7), (IV.3.8) and (IV.3.9).*

#### IV.4 AIRFOIL OPTIMIZATION WITH PRESSURE RECOVERY CRITERION

We consider now the following problem:

*Find a lifting airfoil that achieves a certain pressure distribution on its boundary in an incompressible, two-dimensional, irrotational and steady flow.*

The flow is modelled again in terms of the potential  $\phi$  at every point, so the state equation, variational formulation and discretization are the same as in IV.1 and IV.2. The functional to minimize is (since the pressure is equal to  $p = b - .5\tilde{u}^2$  with  $b$ = constant)

$$(IV.4.1) \quad E(\Gamma_c) = \int_{\Gamma_c} | |\nabla \phi|^2 - p_t |^2 d\Gamma_c$$

where  $\Gamma_c$  is the airfoil boundary and  $p_t$  is the desired pressure distribution on the airfoil. This functional is again approximated by an integral on the elements having one edge on the airfoil boundary, thus given by the sum

$$(IV.4.2) \quad E_h(\Gamma_{ch}) = \sum_{T_i \in A_h} | |\nabla \phi_{hi}|^2 - p_{thi}|^2 \cdot |T_i|$$

with  $A_h$  the set of the above mentioned elements.

The method chosen to solve this problem is GMRES for solving the optimality condition, so we have to compute the gradient of the cost functional with respect to the optimization parameters. The optimization parameters are the ones given in IV.3 and we proceed in the same way: we first compute the  $grad E_h$  with respect to the coordinates  $q_{kl}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, N$  and  $l = 1, 2$  of all mesh points and then with respect to the optimization parameters  $t_i$  using the expression (IV.3.9). We perform a more general calculation of  $grad E_h$ .

The functional  $E_h$  depends formally on the optimization parameters  $t_i$  but it can also be considered (cf [12]) as a function of  $q_{kl}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, N$  and  $l = 1, 2$  and the solution  $\phi_{hj}$ ,  $j = 1, \dots, N - 1$  on the nodes without Dirichlet boundary condition (that is the trailing edge P is excepted). Therefore we write

$$(IV.4.3) \quad E_h(t_i) = J_h(q_{kl}) = F_h(q_{kl}, \phi_{hj})$$

and supposing that a node  $k$  moves by  $\delta q_k$ , we have that  $F_h$  changes by

$$(IV.4.4) \quad \delta F_h = \frac{\partial F_h}{\partial q_k} \cdot \delta q_k + \sum_j \frac{\partial F_h}{\partial \phi_{hj}} \cdot \delta \phi_{hj}$$

We introduce the adjoint state equation

find  $P_h \in V_{0h}$  such that

$$(IV.4.5) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla P_h \cdot \nabla w_j dx = \frac{\partial F_h}{\partial \phi_{hj}}, \quad \forall j = 1, \dots, N - 1.$$

So, we obtain:

$$(IV.4.6) \quad \sum_j \frac{\partial F_h}{\partial \phi_{hj}} \cdot \delta \phi_{hj} = \sum_j \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla P_h \cdot \nabla (w_j \delta \phi_{hj}) dx \\ = \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla P_h \cdot \nabla \left( \sum_j w_j \delta \phi_{hj} \right) dx = \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla P_h \cdot \nabla \delta \tilde{\phi}_h dx.$$

Using eq. (A.15) with  $w_h = P_h$ , (IV.4.6) gives

$$(IV.4.7) \quad \sum_j \frac{\partial F_h}{\partial \phi_{hj}} \cdot \delta \phi_{hj} = \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla P_h) \nabla \phi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k \\ + (\nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla w_k) \nabla P_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k - (\nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla P_h) \nabla w_k \cdot \delta q_k] dx.$$

From eq. (IV.4.4), (IV.4.5), (IV.4.6) and (IV.4.7) we compute

$$(IV.4.8) \quad \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial q_{kl}} = \frac{\partial F_h}{\partial q_{kl}} + \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla P_h) \frac{\partial \phi_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) + (\nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla w_k) \frac{\partial P_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) - (\nabla \phi_h \cdot \nabla P_h) \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l}] dx.$$

We have proved the following

**Proposition IV.4.1** *The gradient of the cost functional  $E_h$  is given by the equations (IV.4.5), (IV.4.8) and (IV.3.9) where the partial derivatives  $\frac{\partial z_i}{\partial p_i}$  and  $\frac{\partial p_i}{\partial t_i}$  are the ones of IV.3.*

We note that  $\frac{\partial F_h}{\partial q_{kl}}$  and  $\frac{\partial F_h}{\partial \phi_{hj}}$  can be approximated by finite difference as follows:

$$\frac{\partial F_h}{\partial q_{kl}} \simeq \frac{F(q_1, \dots, q_k + e_l \delta q_k, \dots, q_N, \phi_{h1}, \dots, \phi_{hN-1}) - F(q_1, \dots, q_N, \phi_{h1}, \dots, \phi_{hN-1})}{\delta q_k}$$

$$\frac{\partial F_h}{\partial \phi_{hj}} \simeq \frac{F(q_1, \dots, q_N, \phi_{h1}, \dots, \phi_{hj} + \delta \phi_{hj}, \dots, \phi_{hN-1}) - F(q_1, \dots, q_N, \phi_{h1}, \dots, \phi_{hN-1})}{\delta \phi_{hj}},$$

where  $e_l$  is the  $l$  basis vector of the  $(x_1, x_2)$  frame. This finite difference approach allows to change the optimization criterion easily.

## IV.5 NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

We use for the numerical tests on both criteria a discretization of the airfoil boundary with 56 points, while 20 control points are used for the spline. The mesh of  $\Omega_h$  has 1000 nodes and 1896 elements. The optimization parameters correspond to the spline control points and to the angles of the airfoil at the trailing edge, so we have 20 optimization parameters because the leading and trailing edges are fixed. This discretization is used for the inverse problems.

For the real problem the number of optimization parameters is again 20 and the airfoil is discretized using 42 points.  $\Omega$  is discretized with 1000 nodes and 1910 elements.

### IV.5.1 TESTS FOR THE VELOCITY RECOVERY CRITERION

The test cases are an inverse problem where  $\min E_h = 0$  and a real problem with  $\min E_h \neq 0$ .

For the inverse problem, we try to recover the velocity distribution on the boundary of a NACA0012 airfoil starting from a NACA0020. The results are shown in Diagrams IV.5.1 and IV.5.2 when GMRES is used for the solution of the optimality conditions.

For the real problem, the velocity distribution to recover is produced by deforming non-symmetrically the velocity distribution of a NACA0012. The starting airfoil is again

the NACA0020. Diagram IV.5.3 shows the convergence of Gradient-GMRES and of GMRES with no gradient computation. Diagram IV.5.4 shows the profiles till convergence of Gradient-GMRES.

We have also tested a more delicate inverse problem, that is to recover the velocity distribution on a Korn's airfoil starting from a NACA64A410 profile, using again GMRES for solving the optimality conditions. Results are shown on Diagrams IV.5.5 and IV.5.6.

#### IV.5.2 TESTS FOR THE PRESSURE RECOVERY CRITERION

The test case is an inverse problem, more precisely to recover the pressure distribution corresponding to Korn's airfoil having as initial configuration the NACA64A410 profile. The method used is GMRES for solving the optimality condition. Results are shown on Diagrams IV.5.7 (functional value convergence) and IV.5.8 (profile convergence).

#### IV.6 COMMENTS AND CONCLUSION

We observe that GMRES is a rather powerful tool in the optimization of lifting bodies when used for solving the optimality condition. We can decrease the functional value by a factor of 100 while the number of Laplacian solutions is reasonable in both kinds of problems tested when velocity distribution is recovered. However, the method becomes more expensive when the criterion is pressure distribution achievement (since this kind of problem is more sensitive than the velocity recovery) but is still satisfactory. In addition, we can see that the boundary convergence is satisfactory in all test cases. We note that the minimization over the Krylov subspace is done by the Least Squares Method (inspite the oscillations we have at the convergence) and not by an exact minimization because the latter would be costly as the optimization of airfoils is more sensitive than the nozzle optimization.

GMRES with no gradient computation (tested only for the velocity recovery problem) behaves as in the case of the nozzle optimization in a real problem, so the obtained minimum of the functional and the corresponding profile are unsatisfactory. The minimization over the Krylov subspace is exact, otherwise important oscillations occur at the convergence. The same effect is observed in the inverse problem, so use of the exact minimization is necessary and the convergence becomes slow. For this reason the result is not presented.





Diagram IV.5.1: Airfoil optimization with 20 optimization parameters. Convergence of Gradient-GMRES for an inverse problem - target velocity (NACA0020 to NACA0012).

Diagram IV.5.2: Airfoil optimization with 20 optimization parameters. Profile convergence using Gradient-GMRES in an inverse problem - target velocity (NACA0020 to NACA0012).





Diagram IV.5.3: Airfoil optimization with 20 optimization parameters. Convergence comparison for a real problem - target velocity.

Diagram IV.5.4: Airfoil optimization with 20 optimization parameters. Profile convergence using Gradient-GMRES in a real problem - target velocity.




Diagram IV.5.5: Airfoil optimization with 20 optimization parameters. Convergence of Gradient-GMRES for an inverse problem - target velocity (NACA64A410 to Korn's profile).




Diagram IV.5.6: Airfoil optimization with 20 optimization parameters. Profile convergence using Gradient-GMRES in an inverse problem - target velocity (NACA64A410 to Korn's profile).




Diagram IV.5.7: Airfoil optimization with 20 optimization parameters. Convergence of Gradient-GMRES for an inverse problem - target pressure (NACA64A410 to Korn's profile).




Diagram IV.5.8: Airfoil optimization with 20 optimization parameters. Profile convergence using Gradient-GMRES in an inverse problem - target pressure (NACA64A410 to Korn's profile).

## APPENDIX A

We compute the discrete gradient of the cost functional with respect to the coordinates of the mesh nodes. We suppose that a vertex  $q_k$  of the triangle  $T_j \in \Omega_h$  moves to  $q_k + \delta q_k$  and the new triangle is  $T'_j$ . Then, since the mesh changes from  $\Omega_h$  to  $\Omega'_h$ , the solution also changes from  $\Psi_h$  to  $\Psi'_h$  and from equation (I.4.5) we obtain

$$(A.1) \quad \delta E_h = E'_h - E_h = \int_{A'_h} |\nabla \Psi'_h - \bar{c}|^2 dx - \int_{A_h} |\nabla \Psi_h - \bar{c}|^2 dx =$$

$$\int_{A'_h \cap A_h} (|\nabla \Psi'_h - \bar{c}|^2 - |\nabla \Psi_h - \bar{c}|^2) dx + \int_{A'_h \setminus A_h} |\nabla \Psi'_h - \bar{c}|^2 dx - \int_{A_h \setminus A'_h} |\nabla \Psi_h - \bar{c}|^2 dx$$

where  $A_h$  changes by a "small" amount to  $A'_h$  and denoting by  $A_h \setminus A'_h = A_h - A_h \cap A'_h$  and  $\nabla f = \text{grad} f$ . Since we also have

$$(A.2) \quad \int_{A'_h \cap A_h} (|\nabla \Psi'_h - \bar{c}|^2 - |\nabla \Psi_h - \bar{c}|^2) dx =$$

$$2 \int_{A'_h \cap A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \bar{c}) \cdot \nabla \delta \Psi_h dx + o(\delta \Psi_h) =$$

$$2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \bar{c}) \cdot \nabla \delta \Psi_h dx + o(\delta \Psi_h) + o(|\delta q_k|).$$

Thus, from (A.1) we have

$$(A.3) \quad \delta E_h = 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \bar{c}) \cdot \nabla \delta \Psi_h dx + \int_{A'_h \setminus A_h} |\nabla \Psi'_h - \bar{c}|^2 dx$$

$$- \int_{A_h \setminus A'_h} |\nabla \Psi_h - \bar{c}|^2 dx.$$

The first integral of (A.3) will be computed using the adjoint state equation.

In order to derive the adjoint state equation we consider again the discretized variational form (I.4.4) of the state equations (I.2.4). Since

$$\Omega_h = \bigcup_j T_j,$$

we have that

$$(A.4) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = \sum_j \int_{T_j} \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = \sum_j J_{T_j} = 0, \forall w_h \in V_{0h}.$$

Considering in  $\Omega'_h$  the corresponding triangle  $T'_j$  to  $T_j$ , we write:

$$(A.5) \quad \delta J_{T_j} = \int_{T'_j} \nabla \Psi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h dx - \int_{T_j} \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx.$$

Since  $T_j \setminus T'_j = T_j - T_j \cap T'_j$  and  $T'_j \setminus T_j = T'_j - T_j \cap T'_j$ , we have

$$(A.6) \quad \int_{T'_j} \nabla \Psi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h dx = \int_{T'_j \setminus T_j} \nabla \Psi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h dx + \int_{T_j \cap T'_j} \nabla \Psi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h dx$$

$$(A.7) \quad \int_{T_j} \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = \int_{T_j \setminus T'_j} \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx + \int_{T_j \cap T'_j} \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx.$$

Further, we see that

$$(A.8) \quad \begin{aligned} & \int_{T_j \cap T'_j} (\nabla \Psi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h - \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h) dx = \\ & \int_{T_j \cap T'_j} (\nabla \delta \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h + \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla \delta w_h) dx + o(\delta \Psi_h) + o(\delta w_h) \\ & \simeq \int_{T_j} (\nabla \delta \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h + \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla \delta w_h) dx + o(\delta \Psi_h) + o(\delta w_h). \end{aligned}$$

According to the Proposition II.2.1.1 we can write

$$(A.9) \quad \int_{T'_j \setminus T_j} \nabla \Psi'_h \cdot \nabla w'_h dx - \int_{T_j \setminus T'_j} \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = \int_{T_j} \delta q_k \cdot \nabla w_k (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h) dx.$$

So, from (A.5), (A.6), (A.7), (A.8) and (A.9) we have

$$(A.10) \quad \delta J_{T_j} = \int_{T_j} [\nabla \delta \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h + \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla \delta w_h + \delta q_k \cdot \nabla w_k (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h)] dx.$$

Since

$$w_h = \sum_j \alpha_j w_j, \forall w_h \in V_{0h},$$

we have according to the Proposition II.2.1.2

$$(A.11) \quad \delta w_h = -w_k \nabla w_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k, \forall w_h \in V_{0h}.$$

In addition, as the solution

$$\Psi_h = \sum_i \Psi_i w_i$$



and denoting by

$$\delta \tilde{\Psi}_h = \sum_i \delta \Psi_i w_i$$

we write

$$\begin{aligned} (A.12) \quad \delta \Psi_h &= \sum_i \delta \Psi_i w_i + \sum_i \Psi_i \delta w_i + o(|\delta q_k|) \\ &\simeq \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h + \sum_i \Psi_i (-w_k \nabla w_i(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \\ &= \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h - w_k \nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k. \end{aligned}$$

Using equations (A.11) and (A.12) in (A.10), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (A.13) \quad \delta J_{T_j} &= \int_{T_j} [\nabla(\delta \tilde{\Psi}_h - w_k \nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \cdot \nabla w_h \\ &\quad + \nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla(-w_k \nabla w_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) + \delta q_k \cdot \nabla((\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h) w_k)] dx \\ &= \int_{T_j} [\nabla \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h \cdot \nabla w_h - \nabla(w_k \nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \cdot \nabla w_h \\ &\quad - (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla w_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) + (\delta q_k \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h)] dx \\ &= \int_{T_j} [\nabla \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h \cdot \nabla w_h - (\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla w_h)(\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k)] dx \\ &\quad - \int_{T_j} [(w_k \nabla(\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \cdot \nabla w_h + (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla w_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k)] dx \\ &\quad + \int_{T_j} (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h)(\nabla w_k \cdot \delta q_k) dx + o(\delta \Psi_h) + o(\delta w_h) + o(|\delta q_k|). \end{aligned}$$

So we obtain from (A.13)

$$\begin{aligned} (A.14) \quad \sum_j \delta J_{T_j} &= \int_{\Omega_h} [\nabla \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h \cdot \nabla w_h - (\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla w_h)(\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \\ &\quad - (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla w_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) + (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h)(\nabla w_k \cdot \delta q_k)] dx = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where we neglected the higher order terms of eq. (A.13) and we used the eq. (A.4). Equation (A.14) implies that

$$\begin{aligned} (A.15) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx &= \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla w_h)(\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \\ &\quad + (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla w_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) - (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_h)(\nabla w_k \cdot \delta q_k)] dx. \end{aligned}$$

We introduce the adjoint state equation

Find  $P_h \in V_{0h}$  such that

$$(A.16) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla P_h \cdot \nabla w_h dx = 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla w_h dx, \forall w_h \in V_{0h}.$$

If we take  $w_h = \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h$  in (A.16) we have the equation

$$(A.17) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla P_h \cdot \nabla \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h dx = 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h dx$$

and taking  $w_h = P_h$  in (A.15) we find

$$(A.18) \quad \int_{\Omega_h} \nabla P_h \cdot \nabla \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h dx = \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla P_h)(\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) + (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla P_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) - (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla P_h)(\nabla w_k \cdot \delta q_k)] dx.$$

Using eq. (A.12), the first integral of (A.3) becomes

$$(A.19) \quad \begin{aligned} G_h &= 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla \delta \Psi_h dx \\ &= 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla \delta \tilde{\Psi}_h dx \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla (w_k \nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) dx \\ &= \tilde{G}_h - \hat{G}_h. \end{aligned}$$

From eq. (A.17) and (A.18) we deduce

$$(A.20) \quad \begin{aligned} \tilde{G}_h &= \int_{\Omega_h} [(w_k \cdot \nabla P_h)(\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \\ &\quad + (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla P_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) - (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla P_h)(\nabla w_k \cdot \delta q_k)] dx \end{aligned}$$

and using this equation in (A.19) we find

$$(A.21) \quad \begin{aligned} G_h &= \tilde{G}_h - 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla w_k (\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) dx \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) w_k \cdot \nabla (\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) dx \\ &= \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla P_h)(\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) + (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla P_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \\ &\quad - (\nabla \Psi_h \cdot \nabla P_h)(\nabla w_k \cdot \delta q_k)] dx \\ &\quad - 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla w_k (\nabla \Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) dx. \end{aligned}$$

The last two integrals of (A.3) are (according to Proposition II.2.1.1)

$$(A.22) \quad \begin{aligned} &\int_{A'_h \setminus A_h} |\nabla \Psi'_h - \vec{c}|^2 dx - \int_{A_h \setminus A'_h} |\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}|^2 dx = \\ &\int_{A_h} \delta q_k \cdot \nabla (|\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}|^2 w_k) dx = \int_{A_h} \delta q_k \cdot \nabla w_k |\nabla \Psi_h - \vec{c}|^2 dx. \end{aligned}$$

because  $|\nabla\Psi_h - \vec{c}|^2$  is piecewise constant. So, by (A.3), (A.21) and (A.22) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A.23) \quad \delta E_h &= \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla P_h)(\nabla\Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) \\
 &\quad + (\nabla\Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k)(\nabla P_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) - (\nabla\Psi_h \cdot \nabla P_h)(\nabla w_k \cdot \delta q_k)] dx \\
 &\quad - 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla\Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla w_k (\nabla\Psi_h(q_k) \cdot \delta q_k) dx \\
 &\quad + \int_{A_h} \delta q_k \cdot \nabla w_k |\nabla\Psi_h - \vec{c}|^2 dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the gradient of the cost functional with respect to the coordinates of the mesh nodes is

$$\begin{aligned}
 (A.24) \quad \frac{\partial E_h}{\partial q_{kl}} &= \int_{\Omega_h} [(\nabla w_k \cdot \nabla P_h) \frac{\partial \Psi_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) \\
 &\quad + (\nabla\Psi_h \cdot \nabla w_k) \frac{\partial P_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) - (\nabla\Psi_h \cdot \nabla P_h) \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l}] dx \\
 &\quad - 2 \int_{A_h} (\nabla\Psi_h - \vec{c}) \cdot \nabla w_k \frac{\partial \Psi_h}{\partial x_l}(q_k) dx \\
 &\quad + \int_{A_h} |\nabla\Psi_h - \vec{c}|^2 \frac{\partial w_k}{\partial x_l} dx.
 \end{aligned}$$

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1] O. Pironneau  
Optimal Shape Design for Elliptic Systems  
Springer Series in Computational Physics, 1984
- [2] E. Polak  
Computational Methods in Optimization  
Academic Press, New York 1971
- [3] W.H. Press, B.P. Flannery, S.A. Teukolsky, W.T. Vetterling  
Numerical Recipes – The Art of Scientific Computing  
Oxford University Press, 1987
- [4] O. Pironneau  
Finite Element Methods for Fluids, 1989  
John Wiley
- [5] Y. Saad, M.H. Schultz  
GMRES: a generalized minimal residual algorithm for solving  
nonsymmetric linear systems  
SIAM Vol.7, No 3, July 1986
- [6] L.B. Wington, N.J. Yu, D.P. Young  
GMRES Acceleration of Computational Fluid Dynamics Codes  
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 1984
- [7] F. Angrand  
Méthodes Numériques pour des Problèmes de Conception  
Optimale en Aérodynamique  
Thesis ( in French ), Université Paris VI, 1980
- [8] R.P. Brent  
Algorithms for Minimization without Derivatives  
Englewood Cliffs, N.J. Prentice Hall, 1973
- [9] P. Lascaux – R. Théodor  
Analyse Numérique Matricielle Appliquée à l' Art de l' Ingénieur  
Masson, Paris, 1986
- [10] Y. Saad  
Krylov Subspace Methods: theory, algorithms and applications  
p. 477 – 496, Proceedings, Ninth International Conference on Computing Methods in  
Applied Science and Engineering, 29 January – 2 February 1990

[11] M.O. Bristeau

Application of a Finite Element Method to Transonic Flow Problems using an Optimal Control Approach

Von Karman Institute for Fluid Dynamics

Lecture Series 1978 - 4

[12] G. Arumugam

Optimization de Forme pour quelques problèmes de Mécanique de Fluides

Thesis ( in French ), Université Paris VI, 1987





**ISSN 0249 - 6399**